

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-12 are pending and are rejected.

Claims 1-12 are cancelled without prejudice and disclaimer; and claims 13-24 are added.

Responsive to the comments that claims 1-12 do not correspond to the claims as filed on June 6, 2000, applicants have cancelled claims 1-12 and added new claims 13-24. No new matter is added.

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below present new claim 13 is not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Williams(US Pat No 6,134,419) because Williams at least does not teach or suggest the elements of a second input for receiving an analog signal and a processor processing said analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal.

Williams shows, in Fig. 8, elements 54 (tuner) and 56 (satellite decoder) receiving signals from a digital satellite system. The received digital signals are packets having a header and payload data. Fig. 8 also shows receiving a signal from a cable network 132. Williams decodes the cable network signal with a QAM demodulator. Williams does not describe or suggest receiving an analog signal and processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal, as particularly claimed in applicants' claim 13.

Since Williams does not disclose the second input for receiving the analog signal and the processor for processing said analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal, Williams also does not disclose the first digital signal processing arrangement, the second digital signal processing arrangement, and the selective delay as recited in claim 13.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted Williams does not anticipate applicants' claim 13 and dependent claims 14-19.

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13, Williams does not anticipate claim 20 and dependent claims 21-23.

For similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13, Williams does not anticipate claim 24.

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, present claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Williams and Dean (US 5,963,261). Dean is cited as teaching converting an interlace video format into a video signal having a progressive scan format or visa-versa.

However, Dean fails to cure the defects of Williams as applied to claim 13 because it fails to teach or suggest the elements lacking in the teachings of Williams. For example, the combination of references fails to teach or suggest a second input receiving an analog signal, a processor processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal, a first digital signal processing arrangement decompressing said video component of said packetized data stream, and digital signal processing said decomposed video component and said digitized video signal to generate a video output signal, the second digital signal processing environment decompressing said audio component of said packetized data stream, and digital signal processing said decompressed audio component and said digitized audio signal to generate an audio output signal, and a delay selectively delaying the processing of the digitized audio signal to synchronize an audible audio signal with a displayable video signal.

Because neither of Williams or Dean teaches or suggests all the claimed feature, Claim 13, and dependent claims 14-19, are patentable over Williams and Dean. Similarly, claim 24, claim 20 and its dependent claims 21-23 are patentable over Williams and Dean.

Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed below, present claims 13-24 are patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Williams and Fujii (US Pat No 5,898,695). Fujii is cited as teaching the concept of delaying the output audio signal.

However, Fujii fails to teach or suggest the elements lacking in the teachings of Williams. For example, the combination of references fails to teach a second input receiving an analog signal, a processor processing the analog signal to generate a digitized audio signal and a digitized video signal, a first digital signal processing arrangement decompressing said video component of said packetized data stream, and digital signal processing said decomposed video component and said digitized video

signal to generate a video output signal, the second digital signal processing environment decompressing said audio component of said packetized data stream, and digital signal processing said decompressed audio component and said digitized audio signal to generate an audio output signal, and a delay selectively delaying the processing of the digitized audio signal to synchronize an audible audio signal with a displayable video signal. Thus, the combination of references, Williams and Fujii fails to teach or suggest all the claimed feature. As the Office Action fails to present a *prima facia* case of obviousness the rejections should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6813, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Deiss and
Mark Anderson

By: /Reitseng Lin/
Reitseng Lin
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,804
609/734-6813

Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 100209